

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is requested on the basis of the following particulars.

1. In the Drawings

FIG. 1 is amended as presented on the "Replacement Sheet." The amendment includes reference numbers for the light beams 40, the collimated light beams 42, and the interlaced light beam 44.

Acceptance of the Replacement Sheet showing FIG. 1 is kindly requested in the next Office communication.

2. In the Abstract

A new abstract of the disclosure is provided above which conforms to U.S. practice and corrects the informality identified in the outstanding Office action. Acceptance of the new abstract is respectfully requested in the next Office communication.

3. In the Specification

The specification is amended to remove reference to the claims and to more clearly describe the summary of the invention. In addition, proper antecedent basis is provided for terms used in the claims.

Concerning the "Description of the Invention," additional descriptive language is now provided on pages 3 and 4 in order to more fully describe the embodiment of FIG. 1. This additional descriptive language describes the different light beams in reference to the amendment of FIG. 1 and the description in new claim 18. All of this descriptive language describes the embodiment of FIG. 1 as originally represented in the application.

No new matter is added to the specification since the specification essentially rephrases claims 1 and 2 as originally filed, and further indicates that the light beam propagates in a substantially collimated or parallel state which is consistent with the depiction of the embodiment of originally-filed FIG. 1.

Acceptance of the amendment of the specification is kindly requested in the next Office communication.

4. In the Claims

Claims 1-17 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 18-24 are presented herein which restate inventive features of the pending application in more specific terms.

The informalities identified in the action regarding claims 18-24 are not represented in the new claims. As such, it is submitted that the new claims comply with U.S. formalities, and the objection of the claims is moot in view of the new language in the claims.

Support for the new claims is clearly provided in FIGS. 1-6 and in the specification on pages 4-9. Moreover, the new claims also find support in original claims 1-17. Regarding the feature of new claim 18 wherein it is recited that the "resulting interlaced light beam is propagating in a substantially collimated or parallel state," support for this feature is particularly found in FIG. 1 and the corresponding new description in the specification on pages 3 and 4.

Entry of the amendment of the claims is respectfully requested in the next Office communication.

5. Rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,464,375 ("Wada")

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the basis that the Wada patent fails to disclose or suggest the feature of a light source system of a projection device recited in new claim 18 having a plurality of dividing elements that divide and interlace a plurality of light bundles into one interlaced light beam that propagates in a substantially collimated or parallel state. Therefore, claim 18 is patentable over the Wada patent.

Claims 19-24 are patentable based on their dependency from claim 18 and their individually recited features.

Turning to the Wada patent, it is readily apparent that there are no teachings which disclose or suggest the arrangement of the dividing elements of pending claim 18. Specifically, the Wada patent teaches focusing two or more lamps at focal points 70b, 71b (FIGS. 8(a), 13, 17, 19, 23, 24 and 25) which are then reflected with the assistance of a prism 78, mixed together into one beam and collimated with optical components such as lenses 80, 81, 82, 83, 84.

Nowhere does the Wada patent describe dividing elements that interlace light bundles into one interlaced light beams that propagates in a substantially collimated state. The action refers to the reflection planes 78a of the prism 78 as separation elements. While these reflection planes disperse the light beams towards lens 80, such light beams are not in the form of a light beam propagating in a substantially collimated or parallel state. Instead, it is clear that the Wada patent teaches that the prism scatters the light beams towards the lens (col. 16, lines 14-15).

It will be pointed out that the term "interlacing" in the context of the pending claims is given its ordinary meaning. This means that interlacing is used to imply that first each light beam is dissected into smaller collimated bundles, and then are mixed

or alternated into a larger collimated beam. Thus, one of the concerns of the pending application is to obtain highly collimated (parallel) light beams. It is believed that this feature is clearly recited in new claim 18.

In view of these observations, it is kindly submitted that the Wada patent fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited in the new claims. Moreover, it is asserted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated by the teachings of the Wada patent to make the projection device according to the new claims.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

6. Rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,464,375 ("Wada") in view of U.S. patent application publication 2001/0015794 ("Battarel")

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the basis that claim 9 is not specifically represented in the new claims, and that the combination of the teachings of the Wada and Battarel patents does not disclose or suggest the inventive features recited in the new claims.

Specifically, the Battarel patent fails to disclose or suggest a light source system of a projection device recited in new claim 18 having a plurality of dividing elements that divide and interlace a plurality of light bundles into one interlaced light beam that propagates in a substantially collimated or parallel state.

In view of these observations, it is submitted that the combination of the Wada and Battarel patents fail to disclose or suggest a light source system that would render the light source system obvious to one of ordinary skill in the respective art.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is kindly requested.

7. Conclusion

In view of the amendment of the claims and the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is kindly requested that the pending claims be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the applicants' attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: April 11, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Justin J. Cassell', written in a cursive style.

JUSTIN J. CASSELL
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,205